

**REMARKS**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1-9 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-9 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added. In light of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

**II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 112 REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN**

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner states that there is no description of structure that performs the claimed method. (See 6/24/09 Office Action, p. 2). Claim 1 has been amended to recite “communication devices.” In the specification, examples of communication devices (PDAs and smartphones) are disclosed. (See Specification, ¶ [0001]). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the claimed method is carried out by a processor contained in these communication devices. Such a teaching need not be explicitly disclosed since it is implicit that communication devices include processors. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the structure (a processor) that carries out the claimed method is implicit in the specification and respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner states that the method claims do not positively recite method steps. (See 6/24/09 Office Action, pp. 2-3). In light of the amendments to the claims, the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**III. THE 35 U.S.C. § 101 REJECTION SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN**

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. As previously stated, claim 1 has been amended to recite “communication devices.” Support for this amendment can be found at least in ¶ [0001] of the specification, which gives specific examples of communication devices. Thus,

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is tied to statutory subject matter and respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

**IV. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTION SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN**

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being obvious over Baker (U.S. Patent No. 7,401,098) in view of De Vries (U.S. Published App. No. 2002/0184153).

Claim 1 recites, “[a] method for the exchange of personal information in a step-by-step fashion in non-trusted peer-to-peer environments, the method comprising: segmenting the information into several independent sections; and *mutually exchanging the independent sections step by step between at least two partners using communication devices.*”

The Examiner correctly acknowledges that Baker fails to disclose that the information is segmented and that it is mutually exchanged step by step. (See 6/24/09 Office Action, p. 5). In order to cure this deficiency, the Examiner refers to De Vries. However, De Vries teaches that two or more entities (people) have a list of interests that are **compared**. De Vries explains that “the comparison continues for as long as each hashed interest, or each bit or character continues to partially match one or more interests of another entity.” (See De Vries, ¶ [0046]). After the comparison is completed, De Vries explains that “[f]inally, matched interests, and in one embodiment, close interests are disclosed to each entity via a results module, 265, 270, and 275 which uses a conventional display or output device to indicate exact or close matches.” (See Id.). Although De Vries may compare the lists of interests step by step, as the Examiner states (See 6/24/09 Office Action, p. 5), the claimed invention clearly states “*mutually exchanging the independent sections step by step between at least two partners using communication devices.*” So, while De Vries teaches comparing step by step, the claimed invention mutually **exchanges** the sections step by step. One of ordinary skill in the art would not equate comparing information with exchanging it.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that Baker and De Vries, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “*mutually exchanging the independent sections step by step between at least two partners using communication devices*,” as recited in claim 1 and that claim 1 is allowable. Because claims 2-9 depend on and, therefore, contain all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed. An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 21, 2009

By: 

Michael Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP  
150 Broadway, Suite 702  
New York, NY 10038  
Phone: 212-619-6000  
Fax: 212-619-0276